DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 126 SO 021 407

AUTHOR Hamblen, Karen A.
TITLE A Case of Legitimation: Art Education's Movement toward Core Curriculum Membership (CCM).
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Problems; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Strategies; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; General Education; Philosophy; Standardized Tests; *Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS Core Curriculum Membership

ABSTRACT

How art education has evolved to become similar to academic subjects and the art education movement trend toward core curriculum membership (CCM) is the topic of this paper. The approach to art testing methods is used as an example of how qualification, accountability, and predictability of learning outcomes are being employed to legitimate art study as a discrete discipline with core curriculum status. To examine the characteristics and processes of legitimation as art education moves towards CCM, the following issues are discussed: (1) current trends in art education and art policy, (2) characteristics of general education, (3) relationships between current trends in art education and characteristics of general education, and (4) the testing of art learning as illustrative of the movement toward general education characteristics. It is essential that these aspects of change in art education are documented and analyzed. The modernity characteristics of standardization and efficiency, which testing embodies, obscure the fact that this model for art education is a matter of choice and that there are other possibilities for change. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334126

A Case of Legitimation:
Art Education's Movement Toward Core Curriculum Membership (CCM)

Dr. Karen A. Hamblen

Professor of Art Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Peabody Hall

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Phone: (504) 388-6867 (office)

(504) 769-9647 (residence)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
KAREN A. HAMBLEN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 021 407

Running head: A CASE OF LEGITIMATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The changing character of art education at this time provides a unique opportunity to observe and understand how a field of study begins to take on the traditional, institutionalized characteristics of general education. The manner in which the testing of art learning has been proposed will serve as a specific example of how quantification, accountability, and predictability of learning outcomes are being used to legitimate art study as a discrete discipline with core curriculum status. To examine the characteristics and processes of legitimation, the following will be discussed: (1) current trends in art education and art policy, (2) characteristics of general education, (3) relationships between current trends in art education and characteristics of general education, and (4) the testing of art learning as illustrative of the movement toward general education characteristics.

A Case of Legitimation:

Art Education's Movement toward Core Curriculum Membership (CCM)

Until recently, most art education has consisted of instruction for intuitive understanding, affective development, creative thinking, individual expression, and divergent responses (Efland, 1976; Beyond Creating, 1985). Such goals were considered outcomes of hands-on studio work, and it was believed that children's learning in art classes eluded most forms of evaluation and certainly could not be evaluated through the use of traditional pencil-and-paper testing. Many of these assumptions and characteristics of art education are how in the process of changing. Statements in current guidelines and proposals in art education suggest that instruction should deal with art as a discipline with its own unique knowledge base, that instrumental (extra-art) benefits of art study should be eschewed, and that art learning outcomes can be and should be evaluated through standardized or criterion-referenced tests (Beyond Creating, 1985; Greer & Hoepfner, 1986; Toward Civilization, 1988). Although many of these assumptions and characteristics are common fare in other subject areas (usually denoted as "academic" subjects), they represent radical changes for art education. In this respect, art education at this time, i.e, the modal characteristics of the field, constitutes a case study of processes by which a field moves into the core curriculum and acquires the characteristics of traditional educational practices.

The purpose of this paper will be to discuss the developing and

evolving actions of art education as these relate to institutionalized characteristics of academic subject areas within general education; this will be referred to as art education's movement toward core curriculum membership, hereafter referred to as CCM. The manner in which the testing of art learning has been proposed will serve as a specific example of how quantification, accountability, and predictability of learning outcomes are being used to legitimate art study as a discrete discipline with CCM status.

To examine the process of legitimation as art education moves toward CCM, the following will be discussed: (1) current trends in art education and art policy, (2) characteristics of general education, (3) relationships between current trends in art education and characteristics of general education, and (4) the testing of art learning as illustrative of the movement toward general education characteristics. Testing will be discussed in relationship to how major education and art education organizations have promoted and supported testing, how rationalizations have been presented for standardized testing, how the case for testing has sometimes been exaggerated, and how testing institutes changes that ripple throughout the art curriculum.

Background for Change[1]

The current movement toward CCM can be traced to, roughly, the early and mid-1960s when art education researchers and theorists such as Barkan (1962; also see Mattil, 1966) suggested that art education should consist of the study of its parent disciplines and their professional

role models, i.e., art criticism and art critics, art history and art historians, studio work and artists. This discipline-centered approach was designated as aesthetic education, and, although a great deal of discussion and research resulted in the following years, aesthetic education remained essentially theoretical in nature. For art education, the decades of the 1960s and 1970s were characterized by diverse proposals that had little impact on changing the emphasis on studio instruction in the classroom; this led Lanier (1975) to state that the more art education changed the more it stayed the same. Belief in the disciplinary nature of art study and hence its legitimate place in the core curriculum, however, remained a strong and respected theme of research and theory development.

In 1982, the J. Paul Getty Trust formed the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and began the search for a theory of art instruction that would eliminate perceived classroom inadequacies, place art on par with other subjects, and have the support of major art education academicians (Beyond Creating, 1985). The characteristics of aesthetic education were selected to form the criteria for initial surveys of the field conducted by the Rand Corporation and later for proposals for curriculum implementation. Subsequently, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts began a programmatic thrust to implement instruction based on art's defined disciplinary nature; this was designated as discipline-based art education or DBAE (Greer, 1984).

In summary form, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts proposed

that art instruction should be firmly based (not merely centered) in art's disciplines which would entail the study of art criticism, art history, studio production, and aesthetics.[2] Content should be developed from the professional behaviors within these four disciplines, and it should be sequenced between and among grades in a written curriculum that is implemented district-side. It was stated that in such curricula learning outcomes could and should be evaluated.

Discipline-based art education might be dismissed as just another art education theory with some relative merits and no place to be implemented. However, the crucial and perhaps determining factors for DBAE's possible wide-spread and even national implementation are its relationship to the characteristics of general education and the way in which those characteristics have been adopted in the promotional, programmatic actions of DBAE proponents. DBAE proponents have found support from the long-standing and highly regarded aesthetic education theory of the 1960s as well as from reform proposals and movements current throughout the rest of education. In addition, there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the status quo by art education decision-makers (read: "academics") based on the perceived ineffectualness of traditional art classroom practices. These characteristics, coupled with the support of the powerful J. Paul Getty Trust philanthropic organization, have set the stage for art education, through its formal organizations, to develop policies and practices that support the disciplinary status of art instruction and its movement toward CCM.[3]

Institutionalized Characteristics of General Education

Although in stated theory the professional behaviors and literature of the four designated art discipline areas serve as the basis for DBAE, the characteristics of general education have served as the overarching model for DBAE curriculum development and implementation (see Arnstine, 1990; Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987). Art educators are not striking out on their own. DBAE has strong historical, theoretical antecedents, and it is moving into an existing institution with well-defined educational practices.[4]

In this paper, an examination of how art education is beginning to resemble traditional educational practices proceeds from a social theory perspective on education via the work of Apple (1982), Bowers (1984), Callahan (1962), Gouldner (1979), and Popkewitz (1977), among others. These researchers have examined and discussed the characteristics of general education in terms of modernist values, bureaucratic efficiency, economic decision-making, business and industry models, the replication of social structures, and, often, the reproduction of social inequities. Institutionalized modal characteristics of modern educational practices encompass the use of textbooks, standardized testing, denotative learning, expert-originated materials, and Euro-American subject content. Such curriculum content and practices support a consensual model of education based on accountability, simplification, abstract and expert-defined knowledge, prespecified outcomes, and predictability.

A pervasive assumption of universal applicability underlies much of

modern education inasmuch as it is believed that one can identify enduring principles of knowledge and of action and that these can then be delineated, quantified, and delivered in an efficient manner (Bowers, 1984). Proponents of standardization operate within the assumption that there are particular bodies of knowledge comprising the disciplines, which, when mastered, will make one culturally literate (Bennett, 1987/1988; Bloom, 1987; Hirsch, 1987; Toward Civilization, 1988). Accordingly, valuable educational experiences are just a matter of plugging into the right system. Popkewitz (1977) describes core curriculum disciplines as singular, seemingly consensual systems which are presented to students in a simplified, taken-for-granted manner.

Characteristics and Processes for Movement into the Core Curriculum

Entrance into an existing institution is made possible, or at the very least facilitated, if the assumed characteristics and processes of change are compatible with the institution, in this case, general education and its core curriculum of academic subjects. It is also highly helpful if the characteristics of the existing institution are themselves relatively precise and definable, provide authority to designated experts (individuals can become self-defined experts merely by being involved in the process of change), and are capable of being replicated in a variety of contexts, i.e, are relatively context-free and capable of being nationalized. Movement into the core curriculum of modern education via adoption of its characteristics of accountability and predictability provides a logical tidiness and certitude which, in

turn, implies that implementation will be successful and will result in concomitant prestige, recognition, stability, and economic payoffs.

Both the character and the processes of general education have been adopted in art education's programmatic movement toward CCM. The institution of general education provides powerful metaphors of language and actions that are embedded in other institutions of modern society, thereby implying consensus, right thinking, and distinctive "American" values. For example, DBAE publications contain language that emphasizes academics, rigor, discipline, authority, exemplars, accountability, critical thinking, clarity of purpose, and so on (Hamblen, 1988a). This is certainly a far-cry from the stereotyped anything-goes, anyone-can-succeed-in-art attitude of the 1950s. Discussions of uncertainly, problematic outcomes, questionable success of actions, etc., have no place in the public promotion of an art program that will be on par with well-established scientific and language disciplines. DBAE proponents as agents of change appear certain in purpose and action; this certitude is also expressed in the final organization and content of DBAE-designated curricula.[5]

To examine how the movement toward CCM is being accomplished, the following processes and characteristics will be discussed in relationship to proposals for standardized testing in art: (a) proponents for change select key or essential aspects for implementation from which other aspects of change will follow; (b) change is proposed to eliminate perceived, current inadequacies; (c) the appearance of consensus and

inevitability is given to the proposed change; (d) success of implementation is exaggerated; (e) the negative aspects of change are not made explicit, and criticisms of change are dismissed through indifference or intimidation; (f) a noncritical stance is taken toward key aspects of change; (g) the proposed program for change replicates the most established and conservative aspects of the existing institution, a noncritical stance is taken toward the existing institution, and a noncritical stance is taken toward problematic aspects of the existing institution; (h) controversial issues are simplified; (i) strict adherence to the characteristics of the existing institution result in overcompensation and distortions; and (j) support solicited from major educational organizations and agencies legitimates the change.

Testing as a Key to CCM

In past decades in the United States, it was often believed that children's learning in art classes eluded traditional forms of evaluation. This situation is changing. Current guidelines and proposals in art education suggest that more rigorous evaluation is needed if art learning is to be properly assessed and if art instruction is to become part of the core curriculum. Michael Day (1985) believes that "the use of educational evaluation is perhaps the aspect that distinguishes most dramatically between what is traditional and what is contemporary in art education" (p. 232).

Educational planners have tended to focus on testing in technical terms, i.e., test reliability, validity, clarify of directions, test item analysis, etc. (Finlayson, 1988). Tests, however, should not be

considered a technically delineated epiphenomena of education, merely added onto the substance of instruction. Testing often acts as a driving force that determines, to a great extent, the very structure by which selected knowledge is given significance and meaning. Standardized testing has been described as a focal influence from which other educational practices develop, i.e., teacher-proof curricula, standardized curricula, lecture methods of instruction, teaching for minimum competencies, and so on (Hamblen, 1987). "If it is tested, it will be taught," is the rallying battle cry for those who see testing as an expedient for gaining educational legitimation. In this paper it is suggested that standardized testing provides the key to CCM in that it encompasses the means, the rationales, and the rewards for compliance to the characteristics of the discipline-based program and, more broadly, for acquiring characteristics of the existing educational institution.

CCM Promises to Eliminate Perceived Inadequacies

Although Day (1985) cited a range of ways in which art learning can be evaluated, evaluation has come to be equated with standardized testing (Greer & Hoepfner, 1986). The apparent appeal for standardized testing and all it entails is that it appears "right." Standardized art testing would give art education the fit with the rest of education—and with mainstream society—that it has often lacked. In this century, art has been seen as offering access to ways of knowing not offered in the rest of education. This perceived uniqueness has, however, been a mixed blessing. Art instruction's being different has not been equated with

its being considered essential. On one hand art instruction is considered special; on the other, because it is outside mainstream education, it is dispensable. The uncertainty, mystery, idiosyncrasies, conflict, and, sometimes, just plain goofiness that art, especially in this century, has often embodied are eliminated in a standardized curriculum and through standardized testing. In this sense, standardization is comforting; it eliminates the unfamiliar and provides a sense of recognition based on traditional educational practices.

Change is Presented as Inevitable

To give the movement toward CCM the patina of inevitability, art testing has been presented as a practice whose time has come, as being supported by a broad-base of important and powerful agencies, and as nearing implementation. Moreover, through reference to aesthetic education theory, DBAE proponents can draw upon tradition within art education itself. The implications are that only wrong thinking and foolhardiness would lead anyone to raise serious objections (Eisner, 1988; Feinstein, 1989).

Endorsements for objective, standardized testing are found throughout the literature. The Council of Chief State School Officers (1985) stated that there is "a definite trend toward standardized testing in the arts" (Olson, 1986, p. 11). According to a state education survey conducted by this Council (1985), "Ten states currently employ standardized testing to assess achievement in the arts on a statewide basis" (p. 5). In the December 1986 issue of the NAEA (National Art Education Association) News, it was reported that 12

states have some form of art assessment. Proposals from major governmental, professional, and philanthropic organizations create the belief that testing is an accomplished fact—or imminent. In either event, a climate has been created that is receptive to standardized testing implementation. For example, Greer and Hoepfner (1986), as spokespersons for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, opt for primarily objective, multiple-choice achievement testing in discipline-based art education programs. Various arts and general education administrators have also lent their weight of influence in the direction of testing. Honig (1985), as Superintendent of Education in California, stated that art programs "will have to be conceived, developed, and maintained just as other academic subjects" (p. 10). In Toward Civilization (1988), a national study of the arts commissioned by the U.S. Congress through the National Endowment for the Arts, the trend toward standardized testing was given national direction and legitimation for all the arts.

Success is Exaggerated

From the rhetoric, one would not suspect that at this point standardized testing in art is still primarily promotional. In 1988, Finlayson found that of the 10 to 12 states supposedly employing standardized testing, only 3 states (Connecticut, Minnesota, and Utah) actually use such tests, and only 1 of those (Minnesota) had repeated its statewide testing assessment. Finlayson's (1988) findings are truly significant inasmuch as they are in direct contradiction to widely

disseminated literature that would have us believe that formalized art assessment is a well-developed trend.

This, however, does not make the powerful institutional statements supportive of standardized testing any less potent, nor does it lessen the testing trend. Quite the opposite is very possibly the case. Finlayson (1988) found that various states are considering standardized testing or are actually designing tests at this time. Testing could easily become an accepted art education practice, with its origins, implicit assumptions, and implications obscured by status reports from prestigious organizations, by glossy publications on tested programs, and by research on testing and standardized curricula supported and funded by wealthy and powerful institutions.

A Noncritical Stance is taken toward CCM; Dissent is Minimized

A listing of art educators initially consulted by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts would read like a Who's Who in Art Education. Established art educators, long associated with and supportive of aesthetic education, were consulted, thereby providing powerful spokespersons for an idea whose time seemed to be at hand. As time passed and criticism of the finer points of DBAE surfaced, the invitations to conferences became more selective, with many initial art education consultants moving out of—and others moving into—the realm of decision making (Lanier, 1986). Due to the ongoing movement of art educators in and out of consultancy roles, decision making processes have been obscured and programmatic decisions have been internally debated. For a theory supportive of evaluation, implementations have

exhibited a surprising lack of accountability. To date, it appears that DBAE has not been classroom tested against other instructional approaches nor have the evaluations of DBAE learning outcomes been made public (Burton, Lederman, & London, 1988).

Published, promotional DBAE statements on testing minimize or more often ignore the downsides and controversial aspects of standardized testing (Greer & Hoepfner, 1986). The negative aspects of testing implementation are not discussed or made explicit, or they are dismissed as essentially inconsequential or frivolous. Conflict, debate, controversy, and the selective value base of the DBAE program are not part of promotional literature or programmatic actions. Formalized criticism of CCM has been cited and dismissed as merely instances of wrong thinking, nay-saying, or professional jealousies (Eisner, 1988; Feinstein, 1989). Anecdotal information in art education suggests that some junior faculty have been told by well-meaning colleagues that they may ruin their careers if they are openly critical of specific discipline-based programs (Hamblen, 1989).

The relatively few specific arguments against standardized art testing that have been published (Hamblen 1986, 1987, 1988a, 1988b) have not had the institutional support of government agencies, philanthropic foundations, etc. Articles on DBAE that have been published in nonart education publications primarily limit the discussion to official, promotional publications or to articles written by testing proponents (Jackson, 1987). The result has been a general failure to examine the

many implications of testing and a failure to examine the value system from which testing proponents are proceeding.

Negative Aspects of Testing are Ignored

When art educators buy into standardized testing for legitimation and accountability, they inherit all the testing rationales and statistical baggage with which educators in the core curriculum are all-too-familiar. However, the well-developed critiques of testing that are very much part of general education theory and research are not part of art education promotional materials (Bullough & Goldstein, 1984; Sternberg & Baron, 1985; Stiggins, 1985).

When—or if—standardized art testing is widely implemented, art teachers will have to learn to deal with test anxiety, test item interference, gender and ethnic biases in testing, memory-response intervals, and so on. They will also have to learn to justify test scores to administrators and to the popular media. For art programs that are already marginal, art educators will have a great deal to lose if test results are not favorable. For high stakes tests—wherein results determine merit pay, student promotion, or the continuance of programs—art teachers will be particularly motivated to teach to the test, to simplify content, and to eliminate any so-called extraneous experiences from the curriculum.

Since most art teachers lack a background in testing and measurement, they will have to rely on experts for test design and the interpretation of results. In such instances, testing experts become, in effect, the designers of curriculum content. To this extent, when

art education moves into the core curriculum, teachers must buy into a system that has predefined rules that have to be learned and followed and that are abridged or modified at the risk of failure.

Negative Aspects of CCM are Ignored; Conservative Aspects are Adopted

Proponents of the movement toward CCM have ignored critiques of traditional academic educational practices and have minimized many of the difficulties continually experienced by other educators. The general education reform movement of the 1980s was itself an impetus for changes in art education; however, it is not the reform or, in Kuhnian (1970) terminology, the revolutionary aspects of general education reform that are promoted by DBAE. Rather, art education, as presented in DBAE literature, adheres to the more traditional or conservative aspects of current educational practices. A desire to be part of the core curriculum is dovetailing with the salient characteristics of traditional practices in general education, i.e., standardization of instruction and learning, predictability of student outcomes, primacy of denotative learning, and a reliance on curriculum and testing experts and on teacher-proof curriculum materials. Control, simplification, and elimination of debate appear in both how the art testing issue has been promoted in the United States and how knowledge itself is presented when standardized testing is in place.

If reform needed to come to art education, it did not have to be DBAE. During the 1960s and 1970s, art educators were busily discussing the merits of art instruction for social responsibility, environmental

design, visual/aesthetic literacy, arts education, etc. Admittedly, many traditional practices as well as recent proposals have done much to place the field of art education on the periphery of the core curriculum. This does not, however, mean that standardized curricula and testing are the only alternatives. It is significant that standardization is being presented as the logical, taken-for-granted alternative.

Simplification, Distortion of Issues, Elimination of Debate

Standardized testing promises to eliminate the messiness of qualitative evaluation procedures. Not surprisingly, testing in art, to-date, has focused primarily on factual information, formal qualities, basic design principles, and on the identification and formal analysis of Western fine arts that are considered exemplars (Art Inventory, 1985; Finlayson, 1988). These constitute knowledge and skills that can be quantified and are amenable to standardization. A tautology has developed in that what can be tested in an objective manner becomes what is considered to be fundamental art knowledge and skills.

In a discussion of discipline-centered curricula in the social sciences, Popkewitz (1977) notes that content becomes oversimplified to the point that it bears little resemblance to the life experiences of students, of adults, or of the discipline as it is debated and constructed by professionals in the field. Likewise, DBAE curriculum content in most instances no longer relates to the work of professionals or how art is experienced outside the school environment (McReynolds, 1990).

The Ironies of Overcompensation

In the attempt to be accepted as a core curriculum subject, art

education appears to be adopting some of the most conservative and questioned aspects of educational institutions. One might consider this as a form of overcompensation, in that it is an attempt to appear perfectly correct and above approach. This has resulted in the exaggeration of stereotypic aspects of general education to the point that some proposed art education practices are a parody of general education failures, e.g., teaching to minimum standards, testing simplified knowledge, teaching to the test, and the use of teacher-proof materials.

Although many art educators are seeing standardized testing as a way of legitimating art's inclusion in the core curriculum, reformers in general education often see this type of assessment as a major cause and symptom of failures in the total educational system (Bob, 1986; Stiggins, 1985). In opting for standardized testing as the way to evaluate art learning, art educators are entering thoroughly charted territory that many educators have found to be devoid of value beyond what it offers in the way of accountability and efficiency. Most standardized testing requires lower cognitive responses, presents information nonproblematically, and does not allow for the negotiation of meanings (Bullough & Goldstein, 1984; Finlayson 1988).

If an education change is going to be considered in a positive light, it must offer a remedy for current or past problems; it must offer hope. Change also must be perceived as workable and as causing minimal disruption to those aspects held-dear or that are part of a field's

knowledge capital. Art tests and their related curricula concern themselves with topics and content that seemingly make little impact on the lives of students. Such content will probably neither cause a great deal of enthusiasm nor will it elicit a great deal of attention, controversy, and, hence, criticism. Much art education curriculum content in textbooks is ostensibly benign; however, by omission, its human authorship is obscured, meanings are distorted, and there is the negation of the possibility that content of substance will be examined (McReynolds, 1990).

In our media saturated society of commercial product advertisements and ever new and improved products, change is often presented with a flurry of publicity and promises of improved life experiences. The public relations component of change for CCM has consisted of a series of publications, conferences, and press releases. There has, therefore, been an appreciable amount of fanfare and publicity for DBAE. However, when change involves movement into an existing institution, change must not actually disrupt the status quo of that institution. Proposed DBAE changes for art education were initially seen by many classroom teachers as overwhelming in scope and as neglecting the ever-popular and firmly entrenched studio instruction (Dobbs, 1988; Inheriting the Theory, 1989). According to original DBAE theory, studio instruction and creative experiences would have been appreciably reduced (Beyond Creating, 1985). Subsequently, DBAE has been presented as possibly working within the studio model of instruction (Dobbs, 1988), with the call for nonstudio instruction noticeably softened. Moreover, teacher

institutes and inservice workshops offer the services and knowledge of DBAE experts to define curriculum and methods and to facilitate transition to DBAE. As much as possible, movement into the CCM is presented as nonproblematic, inevitable, and as not requiring a great deal of effort or professional disruption. One might suggest from this that change in terms of acquiring membership in an existing institution is rarely revolutionary and substantive in nature.

Broad-based Support is Solicited From Established Institutions

Not surprisingly, standardized testing in art is not a grass-roots idea. Rather, standardization is a top-down idea with endorsements from almost every major private and public art and educational organization in the United States (Beyond Creating, 1985; Toward Civilization, 1988). Essentially all major education and art education professional organizations have been contacted through conferences and meetings, and spokespersons from these organizations have been invited conference speakers. Such endorsements consolidate and increase existing power among curriculum, philanthropic, government, etc., experts. As such, standardized testing in art will further entrench and consolidate the power of institutions that thrive on applying their ideas as broadly as possible.

Further Ironies of the Movement Toward CCM

It is possible that although numerous programmatic activities and substantial funding are being directed toward acquiring CCM, the seeds of derailment exist within the core educational institution itself.

While art educators are seriously contemplating standardized testing, many educators in core curriculum disciplines are highly critical of such types of testing and standardized curricula (Haertel, 1986). Some educators even suggest that true educational reform is contingent upon the elimination of standardized testing (Bob, 1986; Stiggins, 1985; Twiggs, 1986). They see standardized testing as reifying learning, behaviors, and attitudes that are not helpful in our pluralistic, multicultural society in which, increasingly, job skills and life-long learning require flexible thinking and an ability to analyze information in varying contexts.

Although some art educators are seeing traditional general education practices as a means of legitimating art instruction, other educators are seeing the art classroom as offering instructional methods and forms of evaluation that could benefit the rest of education (Hamblen, 1987; Twiggs, 1986). Compared to other teachers, art teachers exercise a great deal of autonomy in deciding what is taught and how it is taught. Art teachers often develop their own curricula, and, until recently, there have been few art textbooks for either elementary or secondary levels of instruction. It is, however, in the area of art evaluation that educational generalists see wonderful possibilities for the rest of education. Michael Day (1985) has cited a range of methods for the evaluation of art learning: interviews, portfolio assessments, questionnaires, diaries, specific problem-solving projects, field research projects, essay tests, reports, self-evaluation, exhibitions, and so on. Art teachers have traditionally evaluated students on the

basis of personal knowledge of individual achievement, on long-term portfolio projects, and on ongoing classroom performance. It should be noted that these methods are similar to how adult professionals evaluate themselves or are evaluated by others in their work environments.

Conclusion

Characteristics of art education which are now being promoted, if not embraced, by major art educators, philanthropic organizations, and professional organizations were only five to ten years ago considered anathema to the purposes of art instruction. Current trends and events in art education represent major changes in how art will be taught, the attitudes that will be developed toward art, meanings attributed to art, potential for individual or collective determination of the aesthetic environment, how art content is defined, and so on. Standardized testing, for example, will exert a major influence on determining whose aesthetic knowledge for cultural literacy will be taught. Considering the magnitude of current change in art education and how drastically it differs from previous ideas on art curriculum and instruction, it is essential that aspects of this change are documented and analyzed.

The modernity characteristics of standardization and efficiency, which testing embodies, obscure the fact that this model for art education is a matter of choice and that there are other possibilities for change at this time. The trend toward standardized testing is highly compatible with the power structure of institutional hierarchies and the value system of decision-makers who wish to maintain and

consolidate their control. Such a trend may not be to the advantage of educating thoughtful and responsible citizens who are able to recognize and resist repressive controls placed on their consciousness and behaviors.

References

Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Arnstine, D. (1990). Art, aesthetics, and the pratfalls of discipline-based art education. Educational Theory, 40(4), 415-422.

Art inventory: Test A-F. (1985). Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Board of Education.

Barkan, M. (1962). Transition in art education: Changing conceptions of curriculum content and teaching. Art Education, 15, 12-18, 27.

Bennett, W. J. (1987/1988). Why the arts are essential. Educational Leadership, 45(4), 4-5).

Beyond creating: The place for art in America's schools. (1985). Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Trust.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon and Schuester.

Bob, M. L. (1986). Multiple choice is no choice. Educational Forum, 66(2), 39.

Bowers, C. (1984). The promise of theory: Education and the politics of cultural change. New York: Longman.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Goldstein, S. L. (1984). Technical curriculum form and elementary school art education. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16(2), 143-145.

Burton, J., Lederman, A., & London, P. (1988). Beyond DBAE: The case of multiple visions of art education. North Dartmouth, MI: Southeastern Massachusetts University.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Clark, G., Day, M., & Greer, D. (1987). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art. Journal of Aesthetic Art Education, 21(2), 129-193.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1985). Arts, education and the states: A survey of state education policies. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Day, M. (1985). Evaluating student achievement in discipline-based art programs. Studies in Art Education, 26(4), 232-240.

Dobbs, S. (1988). Perceptions of discipline-based art education and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Efland, A. (1976). The school art style: A functional analysis. Studies in Art Education, 17(2), 37-44.

Eisner, E. W. (1988). Discipline-based art education: Its criticism and its critics. Art Education, 41(6), 7-13.

Feinstein, H. (1989). Beware the chant of "pluralistic pluralism." Art Education, 42(6), 6-7.

Finlayson, S. J. (1988). A critical description of selected state level visual arts assessment instruments. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Gouldner, A. W. (1979). The future of intellectuals and the rise of

the new class. New York: The Seabury Press.

Greer, W. D. (1984). A discipline-based view of art education. Studies in Art Education, 25(4), 212-218.

Greer, W. D., & Hoepfner, R. (1986). Achievement testing in the visual arts. Design for Arts in Education, 88(1), 43-47.

Haertel, E. (1986). The valid use of student performance measures for teacher evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 8(1), 45-60.

Hamblen, K. A. (1986) Testing in art: A view from the classroom. Design for Arts in Education, 88(1), 12-16

Hamblen, K. A. (1987). What general education can tell us about testing in art. Studies in Art Education, 28(2), 68-78.

Hamblen, K. A. (1988a). If it is to be tested, it will be taught: A rationale worthy of examination. Art Education, 42(5), 59-62.

Hamblen, K. A. (1988b). Testing in art: A critical theory perspective. Viewpoints: Dialogue in Art Education, 31-42.

Hamblen, K. A. (1988c). What does DBAE teach? Art Education, 41(2), 23-24, 33-35.

Hamblen, K. A. (1989). An elaboration on meanings and motives. Art Education, 42(4), 6-7.

Hamblen, K. A. (1990). Theory-practice schisms in the 1990s. In B. Little (Ed.), Secondary art education: An anthology of issues (pp. 211-223). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Honig, B. (1985, September). Schools chief Bill Honig calls for strong commitment to the arts in education. The Painted Monkey, pp. 1, 10.

Inheriting the theory: New voices and multiple perspectives on DBAE. (1989). Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Jackson, P. W. (1987). Mainstreaming art: An essay on discipline-based art education. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 39-43.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lanier, V. (1975). Objectives of art education: The impact of time. Peabody Journal of Education, 52(3), 180-186.

Lanier, V. (1986). To eat your cake and have it too: A response to beyond creating, 27(3), 109-114.

Mattil, E. L. (Ed.). (1966). A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

McReynolds, T. (1990). An examination of discipline-base art materials using criteria established from discipline-based art education theory. Unpublished thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

NAEA News. (1986). 28(6).

Olson, L. (1986, January). Efforts converging to bolster arts education. The Painted Monkey, pp. 1, 11.

Popkewitz, T. (1977). The latent values of the discipline-centered curriculum. Theory and Research in Social Education, 5(2), 41-60.

Sternberg, R. J., & Baron, J. B. (1985). A statewide approach to

measuring critical thinking skills. Educational Leadership, 43(2), 40-43.

Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Improving assessment where it means the most: In the classroom. Educational Leadership, 43(2), 69-76.

Toward civilization: A report on arts education. (1988). Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts.

Twiggs, L. F. (1986). On art education and testing in a period of educational reform. Design for Arts in Education, 88(1), 51-54.

Footnotes

[1]Developments in art education will be described in this paper as changes rather than as reforms in order to include both change that is proposed for purposes of instructional improvement and change proposed for purposes of educational, institutional legitimation—with the acknowledgement that these two purposes are not mutually exclusive.

[2]The four identified disciplines are not definitive of disciplinary "possibilities" for art nor are the four disciplinary designations of DBAE beyond debate (see Burton, Lederman, & London, 1988).

[3]This paper deals with the movement toward core curriculum membership. For a discussion of the extent to which discipline-based programs might actually be implemented and successful in the 1990s and beyond see Arnstine (1990) and Hamblen (1990). As indicated in this paper, projected success by DBAE proponents may be overly optimistic; however, as in the case of testing, optimism itself, when coupled with institutional support, may become self-fulfilling.

[4]It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss other possible ways that a discipline-based approach to art instruction could be interpreted and implemented, i.e., not using general education characteristics as the model for evaluation and curriculum development (see Hamblen, 1988c).

[5]DBAE is a theory of art instruction; it is not a curriculum per se. However, curricula that are designated as discipline-based tend to have the characteristics of general education curricula. To date, discipline-based designated curricula stress structure, sequence, and

the organization of content that is simplified, manageable, and noncontroversial (McReynolds, 1990).